

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 22, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends the specification and claim 47. No new matter is added to the specification. Accordingly, claims 43, 44 and 47-62 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 47 is objected to because of typographical errors. Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn in view of the current amendments in claim 47.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 43, 44 and 47-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner asserts *inter alia* that the specification fails to disclose "linearly polarized light."

Applicant respectfully submits that Fig. 8 of the present application clearly discloses to one of ordinary skill in the art that the light emitting from the first polarizing cell areas 34A is linearly polarized and the polarization direction of it is substantially perpendicular to the polarization direction of the light emitting from the second polarizing cell areas 34B. Applicant has amended the specification to overcome the rejection of claims 43, 44 and 47-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 43-44 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Nishiguchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,046,787) in view of Ito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,416).

Claim 43 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 43 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...the first linearly polarized light being substantially perpendicular to the second linearly polarized light..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 43, and claims 44 and 49, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner states on page 3, "...the first and second polarizing cell areas outputting first and second circularly polarized lights, respectively, the circularly polarized light being substantially perpendicular to the second linearly polarized light (column 16, lines 6-24 and lines 48-53)..." The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Nishiguchi at Col. 16, lines 19-20 where Nishiguchi discloses that the direction of rotation is reversed alternatively at every column of pixels. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that although Nishiguchi may teach that the directions of rotation are different from each other, it fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned features in claim 43.

Applicant further respectfully submits that while in the present application the linearly polarized light is emitted from the retardation layer 34, the linearly polarized light is emitted from a polarizer in Ito et al. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill to combine the cited references and arrive at the claimed invention with any reasonable expectation of success, as the background section of the present application discloses the disadvantages of the patterned polarizer compared with the structure according to the present invention. See the present application at paragraphs [0008]-[0009].

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 48, 50, 52-56, 58-60 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiguchi and Ito et al. in view of Moseley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,046,849). Applicant respectfully submits that because Moseley et al. fails to cure the deficient teachings of Nishiguchi and Ito et al. discussed with respect to claim 43, claims 48 and 50 are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 52 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 52 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...the first linearly polarized light being substantially perpendicular to the second linearly polarized light." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 52, and claims 53-56, 58-60 and 62, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

On page 6 of the Office Action, claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiguchi and Ito et al. in view of Deanne et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,627,305). Applicant respectfully submits that because Deanne et al. fails to cure the deficient teachings of

Nishiguchi and Ito et al. discussed with respect to claim 43, claim 47 is allowable over the cited references.

On page 7 of the Office Action, claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiguchi, Moseley et al. and Ito et al. in view of Deanne et al. Applicant respectfully submits that because Moseley et al. and Deanne et al. fail to cure the deficient teaching of Nishiguchi and Ito et al. discussed with respect to claim 52, claim 57 is allowable over the cited references.

On page 7 of the Office Action, claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiguchi and Ito et al. in view of Franklin et al. (E.P. Patent Application No. 0477882 A2). Applicant respectfully submits that because Franklin et al. fail to cure the deficient teachings of Nishiguchi and Ito et al. discussed with respect to claim 43, claim 51 is allowable over the cited references.

On page 8 of the Office Action, claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiguchi, Moseley et al. and Ito et al. in view of Franklin et al. Applicant respectfully submits that because Moseley et al. and Franklin et al. fail to cure the deficient teachings of Nishiguchi and Ito et al. discussed with respect to claim 52, claim 61 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37

Application No.: 10/024,222

Docket No.: 8733.445.00-US

C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: May 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Eric Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant

DC:50405324.1